DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 864 SO 029 420

AUTHOR Frederickson, Karen; Bates, Duane; Lamb, Roberta
TITLE Orchestrating the Sound of Music: Analysis and Design of a University Music Education Curriculum.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Brainstorming; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Models; *Music; *Music Education; Needs Assessment; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Ontario; *Queens University of Kingston (Canada)

ABSTRACT

A research project examined the music education curriculum of Queen's University (Kingston, Ontario, Canada) through a research model that provided adequate, broadly based evidence from diverse but relevant sources. The purpose was to evaluate the existing curriculum and then design and implement a revised curriculum that would be more effective and appropriate in both content and process. A committee devised a research plan to discover the factors used to determine a quality music education program and a quality music educator. This concept of teacher training integrates at least three theories of curriculum: (1) competencies (musical and teaching); (2) human traits; and (3) social skills. Researchers chose mixed-methods strategy to frame the research. A Needs Assessment Survey was sent to a randomly selected group of elementary and secondary school music teachers, principals, and faculty of music education in Ontario (Canada) universities. Responses from electronic brainstorming sessions and post-session interviews held at Queen's University Executive Decision Centre were added to qualitative data from the survey. There were 247 surveys returned. Personal skills rated most important were interpersonal communication, leadership, and respect for others. Teaching skills rated most important were effective classroom management skills, the modifying of teaching strategies, and using a variety of teaching methods. Musical skills rated most important were sharing appreciation for other arts, aural skills, and teaching music by thinking creatively. Results of this preliminary report form a basis for exploring the remainder of the data. Contains 10 tables of data and 52 references. (BT)

Orchestrating the sound of music:

Analysis and design of a University music education curriculum

Karen Frederickson, Duane Bates, and Roberta Lamb

Queen's University
School of Music
Kingston, Ontario
Canada K7L 3N6

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, California, April 13-17, 1998

Introduction

The world of the 21st century will be considerably different than anything resembling that of the past. It may include increasing diversity of school populations, rapidity of change, technological expansion, and budgetary constraints. Students preparing for the teaching profession must have a course of study that reflects challenges that accompany these issues of uncertainty. Concepts related to innovation and creativity, and development of personal qualities that facilitate the capacity to instruct diverse groups of students must be integrated into a subject-related curriculum.

With the addition of a new faculty member in 1994, the music education committee at Queen's University began a process of evaluating and restructuring the entire music education curriculum. The three members of the committee, subsequently the research team, represent differing perspectives in terms of experience in teaching, research, publications, and principle scholarly/creative/performing interests. The first member of the team takes a Rogerian, humanist approach to pedagogy and research, concentrating on evaluation in music education. Having taught at all levels and in a variety of educational settings, the second team member has a greater experience with quantitative research methods, and is interested in understanding as many perspectives of music pedagogy as possible, to facilitate connections between researchers and practitioners. The third member of the research team engages critical pedagogy and feminist critiques in music and women's studies, and has the greater experience with qualitative research methods. In addition, two research assistants were employed during the study. Significant financial support was received for two years from the Queen's University Curriculum Development Fund.

The purpose of the research project was to examine the music education curriculum through a research model that would provide adequate, broadly based evidence from diverse but relevant sources to support the revision of that curriculum. The aim was to evaluate the existing curriculum and then design and implement a revised curriculum that would be more effective and appropriate in both content and process. The stakeholders for this curriculum comprise a large group of people, including University faculty, school faculty, students, school boards and trustees, principals, superintendents, and the public at large. To this end, the committee devised a research plan to discover the factors that the stakeholders use to determine a

quality music education program and a quality music educator. This concept of teacher training integrates at least three theories of curriculum: (1) competencies (musical and teaching), (2) human traits, and (3) social skills.

The research team chose mixed-methods strategy to frame the research, gathering a variety of data that would result in a comprehensive representation of the views of the stakeholders. The primary instrument was a Needs Assessment Survey sent to a randomly selected group of elementary and secondary school music teachers and principals. It was also distributed to music education faculty from Ontario Universities that offer music education courses. The survey utilized likert scales, rank ordering, and open-ended questions, yielding both statistical and anecdotal data.

Other strategies were implemented to gather data from the University School of Music faculty regarding the content and intent of music education courses. One of the most important procedures used to collect this information was electronic brainstorming. This is a technique that attempts to produce consensus among diverse group members. A computer system is used to bring individual ideas and comments to the group while maintaining the anonymity of each participant, and a trained external facilitator directs the sessions toward predetermined goals. The electronic brainstorming sessions for this study were held at the Queen's University Executive Decision Centre (QEDC)), Kingston, Ontario. We also conducted post-session interviews with each QEDC participant, including the members of the research team, and the responses were added to the qualitative data from the Needs Assessment Surveys.

We expected the data to reveal what the stakeholders believed about personal traits to be cultivated, about teaching behaviors to be learned, and musical and teaching competencies to be achieved in pre-service music education. It was hypothesized that consultation and communication would improve the synthesis of content in music and music education courses by students, improve support for music education activities among the music faculty, and improve support for music education in the larger education community.

This is a preliminary report dealing specifically with the issues surrounding the development of, and statistical results of the Music Education Needs Assessment, General Survey. [1]

Background

Educational researchers have attempted to identify characteristics of good teachers. They have defined good teaching in various ways, using differing criteria. In music education, evidence of good teaching has been defined by contest ratings of ensembles that the teacher directs, by administrative ratings and recommendations, by student attitude surveys, by the percentage of students who pursue musical study, and by the size of enrollment in music classes. Student learning has rarely been used as a criterion in music education. Grant and Drafall (1991) reviewed 38 studies on teacher effectiveness in music education and listed some effective teacher characteristics observed by several researchers. They concluded, however, that music educators have not used research findings as relevant sources for methodology. They suggested that the "field of knowledge must be identified more effectively" (p. 44-45). The Task Force on Music Teacher Education for the Nineties (MENC, 1987) attempted to specify this field of knowledge. Supported financially by Music Educators National Conference (MENC) and a grant from Yamaha Music Products, they gathered advice and testimony from a broad spectrum of the music education community in the United States during the academic year 1984-85. Their report consists of comprehensive lists of competencies, personal, intellectual and musical, for teacher candidates, for pre-service music teachers, and for professional development of certified music educators.

Using these reports as a guide, the research team developed questions to be included in the Needs Assessment Survey. Advice regarding survey construction was received from various sources, including the Social Program Evaluation Group at Queen's University Faculty of Education (King, A. J. C., & Peart, M. J., 1990), Dr. Jane Knox of the Psychology department, Queen's University, and the Queen's University Exit Survey, which collects data from graduating students. This advice resulted in expanding the demographic section from more general types of information such as age, gender, and training, to include

[1] This is the first report of the Music Education Needs Assessment data. Reports of the Queen's University graduates, qualitative data of both surveys, the data from the QEDC, and the patterns emerging from the Knowledge Discovery in Databases and Data Mining are forthcoming.

questions about the types of extra-curricular activities in which music teachers might be occupied, and the approximate number of hours engaged in those activities.

During discussions, we determined that there was a need for many types of information. We decided to devise two different surveys, one for the general education practitioner and one for graduates of Queen's University. This would provide data about the present practice of music teacher competencies, as well as an evaluation of past instructional practice at Queen's University. We concluded, however, that either survey should not be so extensive as to inhibit completion by busy music teachers and administrators. We also agreed that each respondent should have the opportunity to add to the present list of traits, skills and competencies, as there may be a discrepancy between theory and practice. Thus at the conclusion of each section of the survey, there were open-ended questions, and rank-ordering tasks.

Method

At the beginning of December 1995 a pilot survey was sent to six local music educators and school administrators. They were designated to receive the English version of the General Survey. The local community has a population of approximately 122,000, with public and separate (Roman Catholic) school boards, including English and French schools in each, as well as some independent schools. The educators possessed many of the demographic characteristics that would be represented in the general survey. Responding to their assessment of the survey, minor corrections were made to the final draft. The general survey was mailed at the end of December 1995.

Participants

The Ontario Ministry of Education and Training provided mailing labels with the addresses of the principals of all elementary and secondary schools in the province. Using a table of random numbers randomized one thousand labels, the mailing addresses for French, English, public, separate and private schools. A French language version of the survey was sent to the 57 French language schools in Ontario.

The education system in Ontario provides for structures that enable students to be educated in either of the two official languages of Canada, French and English. It also provides for structures that enable students to

attend public schools (originally non-denominational Christian) or separate schools (Roman Catholic). There are also provisions for establishing independent schools. Sensitivity to the ethnic and cultural issues in Ontario is essential to establishing connections with all of the stakeholders in music education. Therefore the survey was translated into French from the original English.

In addition to the 1058 schools, the general survey was distributed to 24 music educators of other Ontario Universities. The music education descriptor found in the 1995 CUMS (Canadian University Music Society) directory identified these individuals. This survey was also sent to the 19 board members of CMEA (Canadian Music Educators Association) and OMEA (Ontario Music Educators Association).

Procedure

The first section of the General form of the Needs Assessment Survey contained questions designed to gather demographic information about the respondents' age, gender, ethnicity (optional), and post-secondary training. Questions were also asked about educational employment, including current educational role, level of teaching appointment, type of employment contract (full or part time), extra-curricular musical activities, and the size of the community in which their school is located. Information regarding the predominant socio-economic status of the parents/guardians of students in the school, the percentage of students identified as ESL (English as a Second Language), and languages other than English or French spoken by students in the school was collected. Questions pertaining to the percentage of major cultural or ethnic groups represented in the school population were also asked.

The second section of the survey asked respondents to rate the importance of selected personal qualities, teaching skills and music skills of music teachers. There were 18 personal qualities, 20 teaching skills, and 29 music skills identified in the survey. The items were selected as the result of discussions of the characteristics found in the research literature, the experience of the researchers, and the constraints of a short survey. Each respondent was also asked to rank the three most important qualities from the list of 18 personal qualities, and the three most important teaching skills. In the music skills section the respondents were asked to rank seven musical styles and genres from most important to least important for the music classroom, and to list the five most important music skills from the items presented in the survey. At the

end of each sub-section, respondents were invited to make additional comments. These comments were collected and used as qualitative data, the results to be reported in another paper.

Results

Data Summary

There were 247 General Surveys returned, including 15 from French language schools and 2 from University music education faculty. Although this was a small response, the demographic data obtained from the surveys returned indicated that the sample represented a meaningful description of schools and teachers in the province of Ontario. Unsolicited feedback from those who received the French version was very positive.

The mean age of the respondents in this survey was 38.9 years. This corresponds closely to Ontario government statistics that the mean age of teachers in Ontario in 1995-96 was 43.1 years (Quick Facts, Ontario Schools 1995-96). Seventy-four percent of respondents to this survey were teaching for public school boards and 22% teaching for separate school boards, which compares with government statistics of 1995-96: 71% of teachers teaching in public schools, and 29% teaching in separate schools (Quick Facts, 1995-96).

The percentage of male respondents to the survey was 46.7% and the percentage of female respondents was 52.4%. Although this appears evenly balanced, it is not representative of the distribution of gender in the full-time teaching force in the province. In 1995-96 36% of full-time teachers were male, and 64% were female (Quick Facts, 1995-96). One possible reason for this discrepancy may be the inclusion of part-time teachers in this survey, as many music teachers are employed part-time. In this survey, 35% of the respondents were employed under a part-time contract. The median years of teaching experience for the respondents to this survey was 13 years, while the median years of teaching experience for all full-time teachers in Ontario in 1995-96 was 16.4 years (Quick Facts, 1995-96).

Analysis

Personal qualities, teaching skills and musical skills were initially examined by how respondents prioritized each item, according to the Likert scale: Most Important, Very Important, Important, Not Important. The personal qualities rated Most Important by the respondents were (1) interpersonal Skills, (2) leadership skills, (3) respect for others, (4) flexibility, and (5) role model for students. The personal qualities that were among the fewest ranked Most Important were (1) writing skills, (2) critical thinking skills, (3) accurate in his/her work, (4) speaking skills, and (5) self-confidence (see Table 1).

Table 1

Ranking of Personal Qualities as Most Important

Interpersonal skills	74%
Leadership skills	63%
Respect for others	63%
Flexibility	60%
Role model for students	57%
Lifelong love of learning	57%
Creative thinking skills	56%
Works effectively with others	52%
Listens to others	52%
Sensitivity to diversity	52%
Personal organization skills	51%
Sense of personal responsibility	48%
Self confidence	48%
Problem solving skills	45%
Speaking skills	34%
Accurate in work	34%
Critical thinking skills	33%
Writing skills	11%

The teaching skills rated Most Important were: (1) effective classroom management skills, (2) modifies teaching strategies, (3) varied teaching methods, (4) importance of extra-curricular activities, and (5) stimulates creative thinking. The teaching skills that were among the fewest ranked Most Important were: (1) teaches integrated arts classes, (2) developing a knowledge of music of other cultures, (3) creates/designs customized materials for specific groups of pupils, (4) directs performance-based music classes, and (5) prepares teaching units within long-range scope (see Table 2).

Table 2

Ranking of Teaching Skills as Most Important

Effective classroom management skills	72%
Modifies teaching strategies when needed	54%
Uses varied teaching methods	46%
Recognizes the importance of extra-curricular activities to the development of the program	46%
Stimulates creative thinking	44%
Uses effective techniques for evaluating student learning	37%
Directs extra-curricular performing groups	37%
Devises lessons integrating performance, creativity, listening, theory and history	35%
Sequences musical concepts	28%
Plans lessons for a diverse population of learners	25%
Asks questions effectively	24%
Includes a wide variety of materials in music lessons	24%
Stimulates critical thinking skills	24%
Devises lessons based on concepts of music (such as melody, rhythm, form, etc.)	23%
Facilitates transfer of learning	23%
Prepares teaching units within long-range scope	21%
Directs performance-based music classes	19%
Creates/designs customized materials for specific groups of pupils	17%
Has knowledge of music of other cultures	15%
Teaches integrated arts classes	11%

The musical skills rated Most Important were: (1) sharing appreciation for other arts, (2) aural skills, (3) creating music by thinking creatively, (4) performs as a conductor, and (5) performance-based philosophy. The musical skills that were among the fewest ranked Most Important were: (1) knowledge of early western art music, (2) composing for multimedia, (3) performs as a soloist, (4) knowledge of non-Western art music, (5) knowledge of electroacoustic music (see Table 3).

Table 3

Ranking of Music Skills as Most Important

Appreciation of other arts	36%
Aural skills	35%
Creative thinking	34%
Performs as a conductor	33%
Performance-based philosophy	32%
Aesthetics-based philosophy	30%
Sight reading	29%
Knowledge of popular music	23%
Music theory	21%
Performs in a group	21%
Knowledge of Western Art music	21%
Evaluates musical materials	20%
Critically evaluates music performance	19%
Improvisation	19%
Knowledge of Jazz	17%
Inquiry-based philosophy	17%
Performs as a singer	16%
Composition for ensembles	15%
Knowledge of 20th C Art music	14%
Dictation	13%
Composition for self	13%
Performs as an instrumentalist	13%
Knowledge of non-Western music	12%
Knowledge of Electroacoustic music	12%
Performs as a soloist	11%
Knowledge of Early Western Art music	8%
Composition for multimedia	8%

The evaluations were assigned a numerical value to each rating: Most Important = 1, Very Important = 2, Important = 3, Unimportant = 4, and Not Applicable = 5. Means and standard deviations were then computed for all categories by all levels of each variable (see Tables 4, 5 and 6). The results revealed that the respondents were in agreement for most of the Personal Qualities and Teaching Skills listed in the survey, but were more disparate in their assessment of the Music Skills deemed necessary for pre-service music educators. Performing as a soloist and all of the types of composition were the areas that were most dissimilar.

Table 4

Personal Qualities
Means and Standard Deviations

VARIABLE NAME	N	MEAN	S.D
Self confidence	247	1.571	0.586
Speaking skills	245	1.800	0.669
Writing skills	243	2.465	0.778
Problem solving	244	1.717	0.752
Critical thinking skills	245	1.869	0.724
Interpersonal skills	247	1.291	0.522
Organization skills	245	1.600	0.704
Creative thinking skills	244	1.508	0.651
Leadership skills	243	1.391	0.552
Sensitivity/diversity	247	1.611	0.712
Respect of others	247	1.466	0.661
Listens to others	247	1.591	0.692
Role model/students	247	1.543	0.702
Lifelong love/learning	247	1.579	0.766
Personal responsibility	247	1.640	0.689
Works effectively	247	1.595	0.685
Accuracy	245	1.853	0.726
Flexibility	245	1.494	0.675

Table 5

Teaching Skills
Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	N	mean	s.d
Lessons with theory, listening, etc.	242	1.930	0.824
Performance-based classes	241	2.299	0.853
Integrated arts	239	3.155	0.938
Questioning	243	2.086	0.780
Varied methods	244	1.693	0.731
Modifies strategies	245	1.543	0.649
Stimulates creative thinking	245	1.727	0.737
Concept lessons	244	2.061	0.759
Sequences concepts	243	1.992	0.761
Variety of materials	244	1.947	0.765
Diverse learners	243	2.082	0.844
Customizes material	240	2.397	0.874
Classroom management	245	1.290	0.489
Evaluating learning	246	1.776	0.719
Music/other cultures	243	2.407	0.794
Stimulates critical thinking	244	2.057	0.757
Long-range scope	243	2.132	0.797
Transfer/learning	236	2.085	0.800
Extra-curricular performing groups	243	1.881	0.847
Extra-curricular activity	242	1.740	0.836

Table 6

Music Skills
Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	N	Mean	s.d.
Performs/soloist	241	2.876	1.009
Performs/group	241	2.373	0.936
Performs/singer	236	2.542	0.924
Performs/instrumentalist	234	2.491	0.845
Performs/conductor	240	2.046	0.938
Ear training	241	1.880	0.768
Sight reading	241	1.954	0.760
Theory	239	2.134	0.750
Dictation	240	2.658	0.919
Popular music	239	2.155	0.823
Jazz	241	2.299	0.823
Western art music	239	2.218	0.857
Non-western music	236	2.504	0.817
20th C. music	240	2.442	0.861
Early Western music	239	2.803	0.859
Electro-acoustic	231	2.528	0.879
Creates music/thinking creatively	239	1.891	0.823
Improvisation	236	2.233	0.861
Composition/self	231	2.935	1.103
Composition/ensemble	233	2.614	1.065
Composition/multimedia	227	3.000	1.056
Composition/computers	231	2.649	1.060
Aesthetic-based philosophy	237	1.962	0.794
Performance-based philosophy	241	1.892	0.751
Inquiry-based philosophy	236	2.318	0.838
Appreciation/other arts	238	1.874	0.785
Evaluating performance	241	2.232	0.819
Evaluating materials	241	2.183	0.785

The results were also analyzed for correlation by chi-square. By generating hypotheses and looking at the data from varying perspectives, we attempted to discern any relationships between the variables that might not have been noticed by observing raw percentages. Although the chi-square test yields only an approximate p value, it is a viable test for comparing categorical data. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be significant differences in the rating of importance between males and females.
2. There will be significant differences in the rating of importance between members of varying age groups (grouped by decade of B. Ed.).

3. There will be significant differences in the rating of importance between persons teaching in larger population centers and those teaching in smaller population centers.
4. There will be significant differences in the rating of importance between persons specializing in music and those who have other teaching roles.
5. There will be significant differences in the rating of importance between graduates of the three Universities most frequently represented by the respondents.

The results revealed some significant differences between the responses of males and the responses of females (see Tables 7 and 8). They were related to three variables: (1) the school from which they received their Bachelor of Education (BEd), (2) their educational role (music specialist, general classroom teacher, principal, arts consultant, other), and (3) the decade in which they received the BEd (1950's to 1990's).

In the Personal Qualities section, *Interpersonal Skills* was rated Most Important 8 times more frequently than Very Important by female respondents who obtained their BEd. during the 1970's. All female respondents rated *Interpersonal Skills* as Most Important most frequently. The female respondents who obtained their BEd. during the 1980's rated *Listens to Others* as Most Important 4 times more frequently than Very Important. Older male respondents (those with a BEd. obtained in the 1960's and 1970's) rated *Problem Solving Skills* and *Personal Organization Skills* higher than younger male respondents did. Male respondents from University B rated *Personal Organization Skills, Sense of Personal Responsibility* (Personal Qualities), *Uses Varied Teaching Methods, and Sequences Concepts* (Teaching Skills) higher than male respondents from the other two predominant Universities in this survey. There were significant differences in the Teaching Skills category for females from the predominant Universities, with respondents from University B rating *Effective Evaluation* higher more frequently and *Creates Materials* lower more frequently than respondents from other schools. Virtually all of the differences, for both females and males, in the Music Skills category were attributed to the role of Music Specialist, with specialists rating the significant areas higher than persons in other educational roles.

Table 7

Chi-square significant gender differences-Females

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	P VALUE
Personal Qualities	Interpersonal skills x decade	0.023
	Listens to others x decade	0.043
Teaching Skills	Customizes materials x school	0.054
	Effective evaluation x school	0.057
Music Skills	Performs as an instrumentalist x role	0.000
	Performs as a conductor x role	0.000
	Western art music x role	0.002
	Appreciation for other arts x decade	0.004
	Performs in a group x decade	0.010
	Performs in a group x role	0.011

*Note: $p < .05$

Table 8

Chi-square significant gender differences-Males

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	P VALUE
Personal Qualities	Sense of personal responsibility x school	0.006
	Personal organization x decade	0.021
	Personal organization x school	0.024
	Problem solving skills x decade	0.029
Teaching Skills	Directs extra-curricular groups x role	0.001
	Extra-curricular activity important to program x role	0.002
	Sequences concepts x school	0.005
	Directs extra-curricular groups x decade	0.012
	Uses varied teaching methods x school	0.012
	Customizes material x role	0.034
	Uses varied teaching methods x role	0.043
	Effective evaluation x decade	0.053
Music Skills	Western art music x role	0.000
	Performance-based philosophy x role	0.000
	20th Century music x role	0.000
	Performs as an instrumentalist x role	0.009
	Early western art music x role	0.015
	Evaluating music materials x role	0.038

*Note: $p < .05$

The results also revealed some significant differences between respondents of varying generations (see Table 9). The data was grouped according to the decade in which the respondents obtained the BEd degree and was compared with other variables. Although the dependent variable was changed, some of the results

compared with that derived by analysis by gender. One quality that was significant by analysis by decade as well as by gender analysis was *Listens to Others.* However, this quality was more significant by analysis by decade than by gender alone. It was rated Most Important by females who obtained their BEd. in the 1980's 4 1/2 times more frequently than by males from the same decade. *Sense of Personal Responsibility* was equally significant as a result of analysis by decade as it was by the analysis by gender. However in the analysis by decade, females who obtained their BEd. in the 1980's rated it Most Important more frequently than males, yet when comparing all respondents, males generally rated this quality higher than females.

There were fewer Teaching Skills significant by decade. *Effective Evaluation* was generally rated higher by females than males who obtained their BEd. in the 1970's. This is different from the analysis by gender, where males who obtained their BEd. in the 1960's rated Most Important more frequently than any other rating. Females who obtained their degree in the 1990's generally rated *Teaching Integrated Arts* and *Planning Lessons for Diverse Learners* higher.

The Music Skills section revealed differences among males and females that obtained their BEd. in the 1970's. *Sight Reading* and *Performing as a Soloist* were generally rated more important by females than males, and *Composition for Self* and *Appreciation for Other Arts* were generally rated more important by males than females. Males who graduated in the 1990's generally rated *Improvisation* more important than females.

Table 9

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BY DECADE OF DEGREE

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	1970s	1980s	1990s
PERSONAL QUALITIES				
	Works effectively with others x gender	0.022	0.031	
	Speaking skills x gender	0.059		
	Listens to others x gender		0.004	
	Sense of personal responsibility x gender		0.006	
	Lifelong love of learning x gender		0.015	
	Creative thinking skills x gender		0.019	
	Personal organization x gender		0.031	
	Role model for students x gender		0.055	
TEACHING SKILLS				
	Effective evaluation x gender	0.037	0.006	
	Uses varied teaching methods x gender		0.002	
	Integrated arts x gender		0.003	0.036
	Integrating theory, etc. x gender		0.006	
	Stimulates creative thinking x gender		0.042	
	Effective questioning x gender		0.044	
	Planning for diverse learners x gender			0.043

*Note: $p < .05$

Significant correlations were also revealed in the analysis of the educational role of each respondent (see Table 10). The survey identified the roles as (1) music specialist, (2) general classroom teacher, (3) principal, (4) arts consultant, and (5) other. The most significant role that emerged in this survey was the music specialist. Female music specialists rated *Works Effective with Others*, *Accuracy in Work*, *Flexibility*, *Lifelong Love of Learning*, *Critical Thinking Skills*, *Creative Thinking Skills*, and *Listens to Others* higher than male music specialists. Males rated *Personal Organization Skills* and *Sense of Personal Responsibility* higher than females.

In the Teaching Skills section, all items listed in Table 10 were significant for females. In the Music Skills section, all items listed in Table 10 were significant for males except *Sight Reading*.

Table 10

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BY EDUCATIONAL ROLE

CATEGORY	VARIABLES	MUSIC SPECIALIST	ADMINISTRATOR	CLASSROOM TEACHER
PERSONAL QUALITIES				
	Sense of personal responsibility x gender	0.001		
	Works effectively with others x gender	0.001		
	Critical thinking skills x gender	0.005		
	Accuracy in work x gender	0.009		
	Lifelong love of learning x gender	0.017		
	Creative thinking skills x gender	0.018		
	Flexibility x gender	0.034		
	Personal organization skills x gender	0.034		
	Listens to others x gender	0.034		
	Leadership skills x gender	0.051		
	Respect for others x gender		0.035	
TEACHING SKILLS				
	Planning for diverse learners x gender	0.005		
	Uses wide variety of materials x gender	0.009		
	Integrated arts x gender	0.011		
	Effective evaluation x gender	0.046		
	Uses varied teaching methods x gender		0.037	0.046
	Integrating theory, listening, etc. in lessons x gender			0.002
MUSIC SKILLS				
	Improvisation x gender	0.007		
	Sight reading x gender	0.038		
	Dictation x gender	0.040		
	Composition for computers x gender			0.024
	Composition for multimedia x gender			0.030
	Performance-based philosophy x gender			0.057

*Note: $p < .05$

Three Ontario Universities were frequently identified as the institution where respondents obtained their BEd. This variable was then compared with the four others and some significant results were observed (see Table 11).

Table 11

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BY UNIVERSITY

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	UNIVERSITY A	UNIVERSITY B	UNIVERSITY C
PERSONAL QUALITIES				
	Creative thinking x gender	0.010		
	Works effectively with others x gender	0.025		
	Sense of personal responsibility x gender		0.027	
	Flexibility x gender			0.050
	Personal organization x gender			0.050
	Problem solving x gender			0.052
	Respect for others x gender			0.054
	Leadership x gender			0.057
TEACHING SKILLS				
	Planning for diverse learners x gender	0.016		
	Music of other cultures x gender	0.025		
	Stimulates creative thinking x gender	0.027		
	Stimulates critical thinking skills x gender	0.035		
	Directs performance-based classes x gender	0.040		
	Integrating theory, etc. into music lessons x gender	0.049		
	Extra-curricular activities important x gender		0.005	
	Directs extra-curricular groups x gender			0.009
	Sequences concepts x gender			0.011
	Classroom management x gender			0.029
MUSIC SKILLS				
	Composition for self x gender	0.031		
	Creates music/thinking creatively x gender	0.043		

*Note: $p < .05$

There were no significant correlations for any of the variables when compared with the size of the community in which the respondent was teaching.

Discussion

We predicted that the data would inform us about the beliefs of music educators in Ontario concerning personal traits to be acquired, teaching behaviors to be learned, and musical and teaching competencies to be achieved in pre-service music education. While some differences between gender, age, and educational role emerged, the importance of many of the personal qualities, teaching skills and musical skills included

in this survey was agreed upon generally by the respondents. Very few items were rated Unimportant or Not Applicable by any of the respondents. There was, however, more agreement among the respondents regarding the personal qualities and teaching skills needed for music educators than the music skills. Most respondents determined that *Interpersonal Skills* and *Classroom Management Skills* were Most Important for a music educator, but no single Music Skill was selected as Most Important by a majority of the respondents. The item with the highest percentage in the Music Skills section was only 36% for *Sharing Appreciation for Other Arts*. This was a concern for our research team.

While nearly all of the Music Skills were rated Important or higher (the lowest percentage of the three combined ratings was 60%), the low percentage of agreement about what music skills are Most Important is revealing. This survey provides additional evidence that there is a "lack of fundamental agreement on what should be taught...[and] little consensus exist[ing] concerning the purposes and objectives of music education, much less the best methods to achieve them" (Grant & Drafall, 1991, p. 44).

Some of the gender differences that were observed in this survey parallel those found in the larger community, such as females valuing issues pertaining to interpersonal relationships, and males valuing issues of responsibility and leadership. This is not surprising as music educators are equally members of the society and are not immune to stereotypical behavior. Perhaps an awareness of these differences may encourage University educators to assist pre-service teachers to explore their personal beliefs and values and their impact on music education.

The differences observed between respondents that obtained the BEd. in different decades may represent trends and perspectives that have appeared throughout the past 30 years of teacher education. In the 1970's setting clear objectives, evaluation of pupils, and team teaching were emphasized in many teacher education curricula. In the 1990's issues surrounding diverse learner populations and integrating curricula have come to the forefront of educational discourse. Further research would be required to confirm this perception, correlating music education curricula with responses by decade and by school. We believe that the analysis and comparison of the data from the Queen's University Graduates Survey may reveal some

aspects of this correlation. This is one type of information we require for revision of the music education curriculum at Queen's University.

Most of the significant differences in educational role were revealed in the Music Specialist category. In this group, there were significant differences between the responses of males and females. This parallels the findings in the analysis by gender, and emphasizes the importance of addressing gender issues in the education of music teachers. Where Administrators significantly differed from the other groups was in selecting *Respect for Others* and *Uses Varied Teaching Methods* as Most Important more frequently. This is also not surprising, as these are areas important to a successful school. The data reveals that Classroom Teachers value the integration of performance, creativity, music theory, listening, and music history in music lessons. They also value the use of varied teaching methods almost as much as Administrators do. This is logical, as this group of educators usually has a more diverse teaching assignment. There appears to be more similarity between what Administrators and Classroom Teachers value than what Music Specialists value, and therefore this should be of some concern to University music educators.

The results of this preliminary report form a basis for exploring the remainder of the data: Queen's University Graduates Survey, electronic brainstorming, qualitative responses, and data mining patterns. Together these will present a more comprehensive representation of the beliefs and values held by many of the stakeholders in pre-service music education.

References

Aitken, G. (1993). Interactive multimedia: A new tutor. National Association of Schools of Music, 68, 97-102. (meeting of region three)

Blount, G. G. (1989). A music curriculum for the twenty-first century. In Computers in Music Research, 121-144.

Boardman, E. (1989). Core thinking skills in music. In Dimensions of Musical Thinking, 46-56.

Brand, M. (1984). Music teacher effectiveness research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253443)

Burge, D. (1989). College music programs: Progress without purpose. The Instrumentalist, 23-29.

Colwell, R. J. (1990). Leadership through standards in music education. National Association of Schools of Music, 65, 131-139.

Conrad, C. F., & Wilson, R. W. (1986). Academic program reviews. Washington, DC: Association for For the study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284522)

Cooper, L. G. (1994). A study of the core-curriculum for the preparation of instrumental music educators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 55/01, 37A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 9417232)

Covaleskie, J. F. (1994). The educational system and resistance to reform: The limits of policy. Educational Policy Analysis Archives [On-line serial], 2(4). Available FTP: Hostname: olam.ed.asu.edu Directory: epaa/v2n4.html

Curry, B. K. (1992). Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Washington, DC School of Education and Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358811)

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The right to learn and the advancement of teaching: Research, policy, and Practice for democratic education. Educational Researcher, 25, 5-17.

Dilworth, M. E., & Imig, D. G. (1995). Professional teacher development and the reform agenda. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383694)

Fink, R. R. (1989). Outcomes assessment for music programs. National Association of Schools of Music Proceedings, conference no. 64, 93-94.

Fink, R. R. (1991). The development of basic skills as an integral part of undergraduate musicianship. National Association of Schools of Music, 66, 9-14.

Flower, J. A. (1985). The music curriculum in contrast to the music profession: A lack of fit. International Music Education, 12, 46-54.

Floyd, C. E. (1986). Faculty participation in decision making. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284520)

Gallupe, R. B., & Cooper, W. H. (1993). Brainstorming electronically. Sloan Management Review, 35(1).

Gelatt, H. B. (1992). Positive uncertainty: A paradoxical philosophy of counseling whose time has come. Ann Arbor, MI: ERIC Clearinghouse on counseling and personnel services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347486)

Grant, J. W., & Drafall, L. E. (1991). Teacher effectiveness research: A review and comparison. The Bulletin of the Council of Research in Music Education, 108, 31-48.

Gregg, S. (1992). Systemic reform--Monitoring its progress. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363955)

Heaney, B. (1990). The assessment of educational outcomes. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321834)

Hearson, R. H. (1983). Leadership and self-confidence: A case study investigation of the relationship of Prior experiences to self-confidence, leadership, and student teaching activities. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45/01, 111A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 8409949)

Hobbs, W. (1993). Pattern and sequence in the undergraduate music curriculum. National Association of Schools of Music, 68, 113-123. (meeting of region four)

Horak, W. J. (1982). Personal/professional characteristics and teachers' attitudes about science. The Clearinghouse, 56, 78-81.

House, R. (1973). Building the music curriculum. In Administration in Music Education, 72-73. New York: Prentice Hall.

Howell, S., & Murphy, K. (1993). Creative and critical thinking: Can music technology assist both? National Association of Schools of Music, 68, 103-112. (meeting of region three)

Jennings, D. L. (1988). The effectiveness of instrumental music teacher preservice training experiences as Perceived by college and high school band directors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50/04, 825A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 8910137)

Jorgensen, E. R. (1988). The curriculum design process in music. College Music Symposium, 28, 94-105.

King, A. J. C., & Peart, M. J. (1990). The good school: Strategies for making secondary schools effective. Toronto, ON: Educational Services Centre (Research), Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

Klocko, D. (1987). Undergraduate music curriculum. The Sonneck Society Bulletin for American Music, 13(1), 12-13.

LeBlanc, A. (1989). Organizing college music courses. Music Educators Journal, 31-34.

Liontos, L. B. (1994). Shared decision-making. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368034)

Mabry, T. N. (1988). Program review. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291441)

Mackay, A. (1984). Education law in Canada. Toronto: Emond-Montgomery.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66(4).

Poggio, J. P., Glasnapp, D. R., & Burry, J. a. (1989, March). Teaching characteristics: A search for classifications. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA, March 28-30, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325479)

Pohlmann, K. C. (1992). Music engineering is not an oxymoron. National Association of Schools of Music, 67, 97-99. (meeting of region one)

Prager, K. (1993). Collegial process versus curricular focus: Dilemma for principal leadership? Brief to Principals, No. 5. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356550)

Pratt, D. (1980). Curriculum design and development. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Quick facts: Ontario schools 1995-96. Available FTP: Hostname: edu.gov.on.ca Directory: eng/docum... Hure/quickfac File: facts97e.html#number

Roberts, B. A. (1991). Crocker's teacher paradigm and the challenge of alternative musics. Paper Presented to the Canadian Music Educators Association Research Council, 16th biennial National Conference, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, May 8-11, 1991. (Available FTP: Hostname: stemnet.nf.ca Directory: ~barobert/.mun File: paradigm.html)

Rush, S. G. N. (1992). Leadership and administrative tasks of secondary choral music educators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53/12, 4245A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 9308915)

Saylor, J. G., Alexander, W. M., & Lewis, A. J. (1981). Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Schmidt, C. P. (1989). An investigation of undergraduate music education curriculum content. Bulletin for the Council of Research in Music Education, 99, 42-56.

Schmidt, M. (1994). Defining "good" music teaching: Four student teachers beliefs and practices. Paper presented at the Qualitative Methodologies in Music Education Research Conference, Urbana, IL, May 19-21, 1994. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375079)

Soderblom, C. J. (1982). Music and music-teaching competencies considered essential for first-year elementary school general music teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/04, 1075A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 8222272)

Stark, J. S. (1987). Professional education. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284527)

Toombs, W., & Tierney, W. (1992). Meeting the mandate: Renewing the college and departmental curriculum. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Washington, DC School of Education and Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347957)

Wagner, J. O. (1993). Locating education and literacy statistics. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363796)

Weimer, G. (1989). What high school music teachers should know: A case study and college syllabus. Dialogue in Instrumental Music Education, 13(1), 1-17.

Willis, D. O. (1989). The nature and value of preprofessional experience in the development of choral conductors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50/09, 2702A. (University Microfilms No. AAC 9006015)

Zenger, W. F., & Zenger, S. K. (1982). Curriculum planning: A ten-step process. Palo Alto, CA: R & E Research Associates.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Orchestrating The Sound of music: Analysis and Design of a University music education curriculum	
Author(s): KAREN FREDERICKSON, DUANE BATES, ROBERTA LAMB	
Corporate Source: Queen's University	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1	2A	2B
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☒	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: KB Frederick	Printed Name/Position/Title: KAREN B. FREDERICKSON, ED.
Organization/Address: Queen's University, School of Music, Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6	Telephone: 613-545-2066 FAX: 613-545-6808
	E-Mail Address: KF6@POST.queensu.ca Date: April 16/98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to FRIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
1129 SHRIVER LAB, CAMPUS DRIVE
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com